



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/662,258	09/14/2000	Judith E. Schwabe	SUN-P4175	1082

7590 07/28/2004

THELEN REID & PRIEST LLP
ATTN: David B. Ritchie
P O Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640

EXAMINER

GODDARD, BRIAN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/662,258

Applicant(s)

SCHWABE, JUDITH E.

Examiner

Brian Goddard

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3,4,10,11,17,18 and 22-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3,4,10,11,17,18 and 22-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 14,15,16 & 19.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the Request for Continued Examination and Amendment C, filed 07 May 2004.
2. Claims 3-4, 10-11, 17-18 and 22-35 are pending in this application. Claims 3, 10, 17, 22, 24, 27, 30 and 33 are independent claims. In Amendment C, claims 1-2, 5-9, 12-16 & 19-21 were cancelled; claims 22-35 were added; and claims 3, 10 and 17 were amended. This action is non-final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 3-4, 10-11, 17-18, 22-25, 27-28, 30-31 and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,408,665 to Fitzgerald in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,526,571 to Aizikowitz et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,907,704 to Gudmundson et al.

Referring to claim 3, Fitzgerald teaches a system and method for listing public elements in a library as claimed. See Figures 3-4 and the corresponding portions of Fitzgerald's specification for this disclosure. Refer also to claims 1 and 6 for more details of this disclosure. In particular, Fitzgerald teaches a method for representing an application programming interface (API) definition for a programming language library [260], said method comprising:

creating [Librarian 265 creates] a public list [Standard Dictionary 360 (also 430):
'a list of the library's public symbols and module names' (Column 8, lines 51-59)]
including all public elements [library object modules (See Fig. 3B)] defined in said
programming language library, said public list including a class sublist [Dependency List
445] for each of said public elements, each said class sublist including all direct and
indirect public superclasses of a class ['each module it needs' (Column 11, lines 17-25)
See also Column 3, lines 13-25]; and

storing [stored in Library File 410 (See Fig. 4A)] said list.

Fitzgerald does not explicitly state that the library (260) is an object-oriented
library as claimed, and thus does not expressly state that the public elements are public
classes and interfaces. However, Fitzgerald does state that in the preferred
embodiment, the programming language specific to the system is Borland C++. See
column 5, lines 46-59 for this disclosure. C++ being an object-oriented language, this
provides direct suggestion for using an object-oriented library for Fitzgerald's library as
claimed. Furthermore, one can infer that Fitzgerald's library is object-oriented because
it stores objects. See Figures 3B-4A and the corresponding portions of Fitzgerald's
specification for this disclosure.

Aizikowitz teaches a system and method similar to that of Fitzgerald, wherein a
class dependency hierarchy is generated from an object oriented library. See Figures 1
& 2 and the corresponding portions of Aizikowitz' specification for this disclosure. In
particular, Aizikowitz teaches the practice of creating a class hierarchy (CHG) for
classes and interfaces of a Java package (object-oriented library). Furthermore,

Aizikowitz' public elements (as applied to Fitzgerald) comprise classes and interfaces as claimed. See Figure 2; column 2, lines 58-59; and column 3, lines 40-46 of Aizikowitz' specification for this disclosure. Finally, Aizikowitz' public hierarchically-related elements (as applied to Fitzgerald) comprise public superclasses and public superinterfaces of said classes and said interfaces as claimed. See Figure 2 and column 7, lines 25-30 of Aizikowitz' specification, in light Fitzgerald's disclosure of the Dependency List in the combination above, for this disclosure.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Fitzgerald's method of creating a list of public elements reflecting their dependencies to the object-oriented library of Aizikowitz in order to derive the object-oriented library's dependency hierarchy in a list structure as claimed. One would have been motivated to do so because of the suggestions provided by Fitzgerald as above.

Neither Fitzgerald nor Aizikowitz explicitly state that each class sublist excludes private classes as claimed. However, Aizikowitz does mention the usage of encapsulation in conjunction with Figure 2. Gudmundson, a system and method similar to those of Fitzgerald and Aizikowitz, shows that the purpose of encapsulation in object-oriented programming is to hide private objects from all but the class to which they directly belong. See e.g. the Background of the Invention section of Gudmundson's specification for this disclosure. Thus, by Aizikowitz' disclosure of encapsulation, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that Aizikowitz' method (as combined with Fitzgerald) would display the class

sublist including the public superclasses, but excluding the private classes as claimed, given Gudmundson's disclosure of the purpose for encapsulation. One would have been motivated to combine the references as such in order to fill the void created by Aizikowitz' lack of description on encapsulation.

Referring to claim 4, the system and method of Fitzgerald in view of Aizikowitz and Gudmundson as applied to claim 1 above discloses the invention as claimed. Aizikowitz' object-oriented library (as applied to Fitzgerald) is a Java package as claimed. See Figure 1 and column 2, line 50 et seq. of Aizikowitz' specification for this disclosure.

Claims 10-11 are rejected on the same basis as claims 3-4 respectively. See the discussions regarding claims 3-4 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claims 17-18 are rejected on the same basis as claims 3-4 respectively. See the discussions regarding claims 3-4 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claims 22-23 are rejected on the same basis as claims 3-4 respectively. See the discussions regarding claims 3-4 above for the details of this disclosure.

Referring to claim 24, the system and method of Fitzgerald in view of Aizikowitz and Gudmundson as applied to claim 3 above discloses the invention as claimed. See Figure 6 and the corresponding portion of Fitzgerald's specification for this disclosure. In particular, Fitzgerald (as modified by Aizikowitz and Gudmundson) teaches a method for determining a program hierarchy, said method comprising:

receiving [Step 601] an application programming interface (API) definition file [Standard and Extended Dictionaries] for an object-oriented library, said API definition file including...[See the discussion regarding claim 3 above]; and

traversing the program hierarchy through the dependency list [See Fig. 6C].

Fitzgerald (as modified by Aizikowitz and Gudmundson) does not explicitly teach the step of "indicating a first public element is a direct parent of a second public element" as claimed. However, looking at the structure of Fitzgerald's (as modified by Aizikowitz and Gudmundson) Extended Dictionary described above with regard to claims 1 and 2, one can infer that the direct parent of a specific module (public element) is represented in the sublist (dependency list) of that module, but is not represented in the sublist of any other modules listed in that module's sublist. In other words, in order to traverse Fitzgerald's (as modified by Aizikowitz and Gudmundson) hierarchy, a first module's direct parent can be found by searching that first module's sublist to find the second module that is not listed in the sublist for any other module in the first module's sublist.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to program Fitzgerald's (as modified by Aizikowitz and Gudmundson) system to traverse the Extended Dictionary's hierarchy to find a first module's direct parent by searching that first module's sublist to find the second module that is not listed in the sublist for any other module in the first module's sublist as claimed. One would have been motivated to do so because this method is easily

inferred from the structure of the Extended Dictionary, and seems to be the only method for traversing the hierarchy possible.

Claim 25 is rejected on the same basis as claim 4 above, in light of the basis for claim 5. See the discussions regarding claims 3, 4 and 24 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claims 27-28 are rejected on the same basis as claims 24-25 respectively. See the discussions regarding claims 24-25 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claims 30-31 are rejected on the same basis as claims 24-25 respectively. See the discussions regarding claims 24-25 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claims 33-34 are rejected on the same basis as claims 24-25 respectively. See the discussions regarding claims 24-25 above for the details of this disclosure.

4. Claims 26, 29, 32 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzgerald in view of Aizikowitz and Gudmundson as applied to claims 24, 27, 30 and 33 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,974,255 to Gossain et al.

Referring to claim 26, the system and method of Fitzgerald in view of Aizikowitz and Gudmundson as applied to claim 24 above does not explicitly disclose the steps of comparing two reconstructed program hierarchies and indicating an error when they are inconsistent as claimed. However, Aizikowitz does disclose the need to maintain integrity of the program hierarchy in order to maintain the signed and sealed status of the package. See the Background and Summary of the Invention sections of Aizikowitz'

specification for this disclosure. This provides suggestion for examining the hierarchy of an API with an expected hierarchy to maintain consistency for the signed and sealed status.

Gossain discloses a method for testing the inheritance hierarchy of an object-oriented class structure by comparing the active hierarchy to a test hierarchy stored within the system. See the Figure and the Detailed Description of the Drawing section for this disclosure. Refer specifically to column 3, lines 6-14. Gossain teaches the two claimed steps as follows:

Comparing [step 18] a first program hierarchy [hierarchy of class under test (11)] with a second program hierarchy [test class hierarchy (12)]; and

Indicating an error [Column 3, lines 9-10] when said first program hierarchy is inconsistent ['when a difference between the current state and expected state...is detected' (Column 3, lines 7-8)] with said second program hierarchy.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Gossain's method for testing class hierarchies into Fitzgerald's (as modified by Aizikowitz and Gudmundson) system such that the system would compare the hierarchy reconstructed from an Extended Dictionary for one library with the hierarchy reconstructed from a test Extended Dictionary, and indicate an error when the two hierarchies were inconsistent. One would have been motivated to do so because of Aizikowitz' suggestion described above.

Claims 29, 32 and 35 are each rejected on the same basis as claim 26 above. See the discussion regarding claim 26 for the details of this disclosure.

5. Claims 3-4, 10-11, 17-18 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,230,314 to Sweeney et al. in view of Aizikowitz and Gudmundson.

Referring to claim 1, Sweeney discloses a system and method for generating an object-oriented program inheritance listing. See Figures 3, 4 & 7 and the corresponding portions of Sweeney's specification for this disclosure. In particular, Sweeney teaches a method for representing an application programming interface (API) definition for an object-oriented program, said method comprising:

creating [Steps 703-707] a public list [Class Hierarchy (See Fig. 3 and column 3, line 59 – column 4, line 4)] including all public classes and interfaces [set of classes] defined in said object-oriented program, said public list including a class sublist for each of said public classes ['for every class' (column 4, line 2)], each said class sublist including all direct and indirect public superclasses ['the set of base classes it inherits from is specified' (column 4, lines 2-3)]; and

storing said list [See column 19, lines 56-62].

Sweeney does not explicitly disclose that the object-oriented program used for generating the API definition is an object-oriented library as claimed. However, Sweeney does disclose the use and importance of object-oriented libraries in the background of the invention section (See column 1, lines 11-24). This provides suggestion for applying Sweeney's method to an object-oriented library.

Aizikowitz teaches a system and method similar to that of Sweeney, wherein a class dependency hierarchy is generated from an object oriented library. See Figures 1 & 2 and the corresponding portions of Aizikowitz' specification for this disclosure. In particular, Aizikowitz teaches the practice of creating a class hierarchy (CHG) for classes and interfaces of a Java package (object-oriented library). Furthermore, Aizikowitz' public elements (as applied to Sweeney) comprise classes and interfaces as claimed. See Figure 2; column 2, lines 58-59; and column 3, lines 40-46 of Aizikowitz' specification for this disclosure. Finally, Aizikowitz' public hierarchically-related elements (as applied to Sweeney) comprise public superclasses and public superinterfaces of said classes and said interfaces as claimed. See Figure 2 and column 7, lines 25-30 of Aizikowitz' specification, in light Sweeney's disclosure of the Dependency List in the combination above, for this disclosure.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Sweeney's method of creating a list of public elements reflecting their dependencies to the object-oriented library of Aizikowitz in order to derive the object-oriented library's dependency hierarchy in a list structure as claimed. One would have been motivated to do so because of the suggestions provided by Sweeney as above. It would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to exclude private classes from the sublist as taught by Gudmundson, for the same reasons as provided above.

Referring to claim 4, the system and method of Sweeney in view of Aizikowitz as applied to claim 1 above discloses the invention as claimed. Aizikowitz' object-oriented

library (as applied to Sweeney) is a Java package as claimed. See Figure 1 and column 2, line 50 et seq. of Aizikowitz' specification for this disclosure.

Claims 10-11 are rejected on the same basis as claims 3-4 respectively. See the discussions regarding claims 3-4 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claims 17-18 are rejected on the same basis as claims 3-4 respectively. See the discussions regarding claims 3-4 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claims 22-23 are rejected on the same basis as claims 3-4 respectively. See the discussions regarding claims 3-4 above for the details of this disclosure.

Duplicate Claims - Warning

6. Applicant is advised that should claims 3-4 be found allowable, claims 22-23 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. Applicant is further advised that should claims 24-26 be found allowable, claims 33-35 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 3, 10 and 17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Referring to applicant's remarks on pages 12-13 and 15-16 regarding the 35 U.S.C § 103 rejections: Applicant argued that neither Fitzgerald, Aizikowitz nor Sweeney, taken alone or in combination, suggests or discloses creating a public list...where the public list includes a class sublist for each of the public classes, and where each class sublist includes all direct and indirect public superclasses of a class *and excludes private classes*.

The examiner disagrees for the following reasons: Aizikowitz (and therefore both combinations) discloses the usage of encapsulation from an object-oriented programming methodology standpoint. As was well established at the time of applicant's invention (See Gudmundson in the combination above), part of encapsulation is the hiding of private classes/objects/elements from all but that to which they directly belong. In other words, a private class, object or element (data) can only be viewed and manipulated by its encapsulated class. Thus, Aizikowitz directly suggests that the class sublist excludes private classes as claimed, through the disclosure of encapsulation. The combination of prior art above therefore discloses each and every element of applicant's claimed invention.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Goddard whose telephone number is 703-305-7821. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9 AM - 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

bdg
19 July 2004

Frantz Coby
FRANTZ COBY
PRIMARY EXAMINER